

REMARKS

Applicant wishes to thank Examiner Caley for the attention accorded to the instant application, and respectfully requests reconsideration of the application as amended. Claims 1, 3-6 and 9-20 are pending. Claim 10 is allowed.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 9, 11-15 and 18-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,095,457 to Chou (hereinafter, "Chou"). Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Chou in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,445,373 to Yamamoto (hereinafter, "Yamamoto"). Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Chou in view of Yamamoto and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,545,732 to Nakano (hereinafter, "Nakano"). Claims 16 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Chou in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,150,557 to Chen et al. (hereinafter, "Chen").

Claim 9 has been amended to change its dependency. Claims 1, 15 and 20 have been amended to recite that the bracket has a light shield wider than the aperture and is arranged to cover the aperture such that the edge portion of the light shield overlaps all around an edge portion of the aperture and the chassis when the bracket is positioned for installation of the light emitting structure in the bay. Support for these amendments can be found throughout the application, such as in page 10 lines 11-20 and Figures 1, 2, 5 and 6. No new matter has been added to the disclosure by way of these amendments.

In view of the following remarks, Applicants request further examination and reconsideration of the present patent application.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1, 3, 4, 9, 11-15 and 18-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly anticipated by Chou.

Independent Claims 1, 15 and 20 have been amended to recite that the bracket has a light shield wider than the aperture and is arranged to cover the aperture such that the edge portion of the light shield overlaps all around an edge portion of the aperture and the chassis when the bracket is positioned for installation of the light emitting structure in the bay. Chou does not disclose this claim feature.

Chou teaches and suggests an LCD television with a detachable backlight module which can be removed. See Column 2 line 59 to Column 3 line 7 of Chou. Chou discloses that cover 33 is inserted in or fitted in the aperture of the casing 10. See FIG. 3 of Chou. The cover 33 taught by Chou is not wider than the aperture of the casing 10. Moreover, the cover 33 disclosed by Chou is not arranged to overlap the aperture, since some edge portion of the cover does not overlap with the casing 10 and is fitted entirely in the aperture of the casing 10.

A further description of this is illustrated in Exhibit A, which is attached herewith and is a copy of FIG.2 and 3 of Chou with hand notations. As shown in Exhibit A, in cross section A, the edge portion of the cover 33 overlaps with guiding groove 11 in casing 10. As can be seen in cross section B, the edge portion of cover 33 does not overlap with casing 10 and guiding groove 11. At the least, Chou does not disclose that the edge portion of the cover 33 overlaps all around an edge portion of the casing 10, as recited in claims 1, 15, 20 and all claims depending therefrom of the present application. Consequently, cover 33 disclosed by Chou allows light to leak out as seen in diagram C of Exhibit A. Cover 33 disclosed by Chou does not prevent leak through a clearance between casing 10 and cover 33 and does not disclose, teach or suggest the

light shield as recited in claims 1, 15, 20 and all claims depending therefrom of the present application.

Therefore, Chou is not an anticipatory reference for at least the reason that Chou does not disclose a light shield wider than an aperture and arranged to cover the aperture such that the edge portion of the light shield overlaps all around an edge portion of the aperture and the chassis when the bracket is positioned for installation of the light emitting structure in the bay, as recited in Claims 1, 15 and 20, from which Claims 3, 4, 9, 11-14, 18 and 19 depend. Thus the rejection of Claims 1, 3, 4, 9, 11-15 and 18-20 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) in view of Chou is overcome. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of Claims 1, 3, 4, 9, 11-15 and 18-20 is earnestly solicited.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Chou in view of Yamamoto. The deficiencies of Chou are discussed above, Yamamoto does not cure these deficiencies.

Yamamoto discloses a removable light source unit, which, after unscrewing can be removed, an optical panel which is secured to the frame and a LCD screen which is affixed to the front of the frame. See Column 6 lines 43-67 of Yamamoto. Yamamoto does not disclose, teach or suggest a light shield wider than an aperture and arranged to cover the aperture such that the edge portion of the light shield overlaps all around an edge portion of the aperture and the chassis when the bracket is positioned for installation of the light emitting structure in the bay, as recited in Claim 1, from which Claim 5 depends.

Neither Chou nor Yamamoto teach or suggest a light shield wider than an aperture and arranged to cover the aperture such that the edge portion of the light shield overlaps all around an

edge portion of the aperture and the chassis when the bracket is positioned for installation of the light emitting structure in the bay. Therefore, the combination of Chou and Yamamoto does not teach or suggest this claim recitation. Thus, the combination of Chou and Yamamoto does not render the claimed invention obvious and the rejection of Claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is overcome. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of Claim 5 is earnestly solicited.

Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Chou in view of Yamamoto and in further view of Nakano. The deficiencies of the combination of Chou and Yamamoto are discussed above, Nakano does not cure these deficiencies.

Nakano discloses the use of rubber separators to hold fluorescent lamps in an exact position away from a frame in the backlight assembly of a liquid crystal display. See Column 2 line 60 to Column 3 line 4 of Nakano. Nakano does not disclose, teach or suggest a light shield wider than an aperture and arranged to cover the aperture such that the edge portion of the light shield overlaps all around an edge portion of the aperture and the chassis when the bracket is positioned for installation of the light emitting structure in the bay, as recited in Claim 1, from which Claim 6 depends.

Neither Chou, Yamamoto nor Nakano teach or suggest a light shield wider than an aperture and arranged to cover the aperture such that the edge portion of the light shield overlaps all around an edge portion of the aperture and the chassis when the bracket is positioned for installation of the light emitting structure in the bay. Therefore, the combination of Chou, Yamamoto and Nakano does not teach or suggest this claim recitation. Thus, the combination of Chou, Yamamoto and Nakano does not render the claimed invention obvious and the rejection of Claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is overcome. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of Claim 6 is earnestly solicited.

Claims 16 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Chou in view of Chen. The deficiencies of Chou are discussed above, Chen does not cure these deficiencies.

Chen discloses a backlight module which houses fluorescent lamps between two optical panels, which are affixed to the frame of the backlight module. See Column 3 lines 12 to 38 of Chen. Upon removal of the backlight module, including the two optical panels, the inner face of the liquid crystal display will be exposed to the ambient air. Chen does not disclose, teach or suggest a light shield wider than an aperture and arranged to cover the aperture such that the edge portion of the light shield overlaps all around an edge portion of the aperture and the chassis when the bracket is positioned for installation of the light emitting structure in the bay, as recited in Claim 15, from which Claims 16 and 17 depend.

Neither Chou nor Chen teach or suggest a light shield wider than an aperture and arranged to cover the aperture such that the edge portion of the light shield overlaps all around an edge portion of the aperture and the chassis when the bracket is positioned for installation of the light emitting structure in the bay. Therefore, the combination of Chou and Chen does not teach or suggest this claim recitation. Thus, the combination of Chou and Chen does not render the claimed invention obvious and the rejection of Claims 16 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is overcome. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of Claims 16 and 17 is earnestly solicited.

Applicants believe that the paper submitted herein provides a complete response to the Office Action, and the present case is in condition for allowance. Therefore, in view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration, withdrawal of all rejections, and allowance of all pending claims in due course. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with the Applicants' attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned, Applicants' attorney, at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Paul J. Esatto, Jr./

Paul J. Esatto, Jr./
Registration No. 30,749

SCULLY, SCOTT, MURPHY & PRESSER, P.C.
400 Garden City Plaza - Ste. 300
Garden City, New York 11530
(516) 742-4343
PJE:KRV:DRB/vc
Enc. (Exhibit A)